

Appl. No. 10/713,231

## REMARKS

The Examiner contacted Applicants on May 24 regarding various editorial problems associated with the above application. Specifically, the Examiner has requested that claims 1, 7, and 14 be amended to correct "halogenated pentafluorosulfuranyl compounds" represented by structures A or B to "halogenated pentafluorosulfuranyl cycloaliphatic compounds". Support for the amendments to claims 1, 7, and 14 is found, for example, in paragraph [0009], lines 18-20.

The Examiner has also requested that claim 6 be amended to remove the additional recitation of "represented by the structures". The Examiner further requested that Applicants amend the abstract to remove the additional formulas listed therein. Applicants made the requested amendments as well as further amendments to claims 1, 7, and 14 and the abstract to correct minor editorial and typographical errors. No new matter is being submitted in making the amendments and the amendments were not made in response to any prior art. Rather, the amendments were made to clarify the subject matter of Applicants' claimed invention.

In addition to the foregoing, the Examiner also requested that Applicants identify the end-product of the synthesis or "pentafluorosulfuranyl arlenes" as "pentafluorosulfuranyl compounds" in claims 1, 7, and 14, the specification, and the abstract because -according to the Examiner- the use of arylene in connection with pentafluorosulfuranyl is redundant. Applicants respectfully disagree. Pentafluorosulfuranyl arlenes, as used in the present application, describe aryl compounds having one or more pentafluorosulfuranyl groups (SF<sub>5</sub>). Support for the term "pentafluorosulfuranyl arlenes" is provided, for example, in the specification at paragraphs [0001], [0009], [0010], [0025], and Formulas C and D. It is well recognized that Applicants can be their own lexicographers. A claim may not be rejected solely because of the type of language used to define the subject matter for which patent protection is being sought. *In re Swinehart*, 439 F.2d 210, 160 USPQ 226 (CCPA 1971). If the claims, read in light of the specification, reasonably apprise those skilled in the art both of the utilization and scope of the invention, and if the language is as precise as the subject matter permits, 35 USC § 112, ¶ 2 demands no more. *Shatterproof Glass Corp. v. Libbey Ownes Ford Co.*, 758 F. 2d 613, 225 USPQ 634 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Appl. No. 10/713,231

**SUMMARY**

It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner enter the above amendments and provide a timely Notice of Allowance to be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Rosaleen P. Morris-Oskanian  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No. 47,321

Air Products and Chemicals, Inc.  
7201 Hamilton Boulevard  
Allentown, PA 18195-1501

(610) 481-8169